

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11 and 21 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments, as support can be found in at least paragraph [0010] of Applicant's specification. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, issued August 10, 2007, rejects claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-19 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,018,739 to McCoy et al. (hereinafter "McCoy"). The Office Action rejects claims 6, 8, 10, 16, 20 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

It is asserted that McCoy teaches all of the features of the subject matter of the pending claims. However, McCoy does not teach, nor would it have suggested "to issue a physical identification token," as positively recited in varying form in amended independent claims 1, 11 and 21.

Support can be found for the above amendments in paragraph [0010] which recites, that the identification token may be a "smart card", identification card, i.e., driver's license, credit card, etc., boarding pass, passport, and the like." Each illustrative example identifies a physical form of an identification token.

In direct contrast, the applied reference of McCoy, as reported in the Office Action, and the Advisory Action, is broadly interpreted as teaching a virtual identification token, and not a physical token, as positively recited in the pending claims.

For at least the above reasons, McCoy cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Further, claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-26 would also not have been suggested by the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these

claims on allowable independent claims 1, 11 and 21, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of applied prior art references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Pardini
Registration No. 30,411

Kirk D. Berkheimer
Registration No. 59,874

TJP:KDB

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 27, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
